

**From:** Tyler Green <tylerg@gis.net>  
**To:** K2DOM.K2PO1(NETMSGSGS)  
**Date:** Tue, Dec 22, 1998 10:32 AM  
**Subject:** Comments to Commissioner Ness

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

98-94

Tyler Green (tylerg@gis.net) writes:

Commissioner Ness,

I am writing to ask that you establish a viewing standard that will ensure households who cannot receive an acceptable network picture using an outdoor antenna can receive network programming via satellite.

I would also like to see the impending court order that will remove local programming blocked until the new standard is in place.

I currently live in an area that is defined as "predictive Grade B" and I cannot get a clear picture by using an outdoor antenna due to the distance I live from network towers.

I understand that the Grade B contour was never intended to be used to determine whether or not a consumer can receive an acceptable picture. It was originally intended as a rough calculation to prevent broadcast signals from interfering with one another.

This standard needs to be definitively established once and for all. I would like to see the standard based on zip code. This would prevent consumers from having to pay from \$60 to \$100 dollars for a signal strength test at their residence. I am in the military and move approximately every three years, so this cost is prohibitive for me.

Thank you for your consideration.

Tyler S. Green

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.0  
Remote host: 129.53.216.2  
Remote IP address: 129.53.216.2

RECEIVED

DEC 22 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List A B C D E \_\_\_\_\_

**From:** Shirley Kemp <shirbee@worldnet.att.net>  
**To:** K2DOM.K2PO1(NETMSGSGS)  
**Date:** Tue, Dec 22, 1998 11:06 AM  
**Subject:** Comments to Commissioner Ness

98-94

Shirley Kemp (shirbee@worldnet.att.net) writes:

My household very much enjoys coverage from C-Span. I am unsure what the 'digital must carry' issue is, but please don't institute changes that will impact those of us who watch C-Span as opposed to the "trash TV" of which there is a plethora. Thank you.

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.0  
Remote host: 12.74.16.71  
Remote IP address: 12.74.16.71

RECEIVED

DEC 22 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List A B C D E

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

**From:** Iley A. Pullen Jr. <ipullen@pcisys.net>  
**To:** K2DOM.K2PO1(NETMSGGS)  
**Date:** Tue, Dec 22, 1998 2:00 PM  
**Subject:** Comments to Commissioner Ness

98-94  
**RECEIVED****DEC 22 1998**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Iley A. Pullen Jr. (ipullen@pcisys.net) writes:

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter is in regards to the recent information that I was given while trying to change from a cable service to a satellite service.

After constant price increases in the cable rates here in Colorado Springs, I have decided that I will no longer deal with the single \*cable company¶ here in this area. Although there are actually two services here in Colorado Springs, the only that offers anything good is Century Communications. Lately, I¶m afraid to open the bill statement because it normally has something in it about adjusting this or another price. Additionally, I am being forced to pay for channels that I don¶t watch. These channels, such as the Golf Channel cost additional monies to the cable service who drops that cost on me, when I have absolutely no interest in this channel.

Having dealt with this entirely too long, I have opted to change to a satellite service, I have additional channels, have a reduced cost, and from references, will also have a much better service. However, while ordering my service, I was told that I could not get any of the local stations, nor could I get any of the ABC, NBC, FOX, or similar broadcasts, regardless of where they are from because I can put up an antenna to receive these broadcasts. After some research, I have found that this is an FCC ruling. How utterly ridiculous! Who¶s interest are we looking out for anyways? It certainly isn¶t the consumer¶s.

Last time I looked, the Government was supposed to protect the average citizen. That sure isn¶t the case here. The cable broadcasters can charge me to get \*local¶ services, but the satellite companies can¶t.....how preposterous. Just how much money are they putting in your pockets? Because the cable service here won¶t give money to the local networks, \*special¶ programs are blanked out. How is it that the cable services get special treatment? Even with a cable service, I could get local networks with an external antenna. Why doesn¶t this law apply to them? If I can receive local broadcasts over cable and am willing to pay for it, then I should be able to do the same with the satellite service. I don¶t understand the LOGIC in this decision. I would like for someone to take the time to explain this to me.

The ONLY difference between cable and satellite is the media in which the signal is transmit. One uses an electrical carrier and is transmitted over copper, the other uses microwaves and is bounced off a satellite. Other than that, the signal is originated from the same point and the destination is the same. Why is it that I can¶t get the one bounced from a satellite but I can get the one over wire? If ANYONE has a right to charge for the service, it would be the satellite service, after all, satellite bandwidth is expensive. That they provide their customers with capturing a LOCAL broadcast, something that is transmitted free of charge to the customer, then redirected to the receiver¶s satellite dish, at the customer¶s request, seems like a reasonable request. If I am going to put up a satellite dish, why would I want to turn around and also add an external antenna, especially when the dish is capable of receiving the same broadcast as the antenna?

The effects of your law have made it impossible for the consumer to get the service they want. You aren¶t protecting the consumer, you are protecting the cable companies from fair competition. In essence, you are allowing them to become a monopoly, something that is against the law the last time I checked. As a result, the cable companies gouge the customers with never-ending price increases and poorer service. Something that I thought this last FCC ruling was supposed to protect customers from.

Please change your ruling and allow the customer to make the choice of where and how they get local

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List A B C D E

**From:** Michael Riggs <kmriggs@gvtc.com>  
**To:** K2DOM.K2PO1(NETMSGSGS)  
**Date:** Tue, Dec 22, 1998 2:06 PM  
**Subject:** Comments to Commissioner Ness

**RECEIVED**

DEC 22 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

98-94

Michael Riggs (kmriggs@gvtc.com) writes:

Commissioner Ness,

I am sending this correspondence as a request for your support in allowing satellite providers the ability to offer network TV to subscribers. I would very much like the choice of how I receive the network signal. Although I live in an area where the network TV signal is suppose to be receivable I find that the signal is so poor I no longer wath network broadcasts. Your attention to this matter is greatly appreciated.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 208.245.199.65  
Remote IP address: 208.245.199.65

**EX PARTE OR LATE FILE**

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List A B C D E \_\_\_\_\_

**From:** Sean Douglas Robinson <seanrobinson@iol10.com>  
**To:** K2DOM.K2PO1(NETMSGSGS)  
**Date:** Mon, Dec 21, 1998 6:32 PM  
**Subject:** Comments to Commissioner Ness

98-94

**EX PARTE OR LATE FILED**

Sean Douglas Robinson (seanrobinson@iol10.com) writes:

It makes no sense why I as a resident of the Metro Atlanta area cannot receive the same local network broadcast from my satellite provider that I can receive in a sub-standard way through an antenna or cable. The local networks need no protection in my house - I want to watch them either way. My frustration is that I have to endure sub-standard quality because of rules that protect cable company mediocrity.

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0  
Remote host: 208.213.212.5  
Remote IP address: 208.213.212.5

**RECEIVED**  
**DEC 22 1998**  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List A B C D E